

Ranking and Comments on General Education Models

Submitted by: Murdoch Maloney
San Juan College
Assessment Team Chair

General Comments:

1. Overall the skills models appear to ignore or dismiss the broad concept of general education. Several, if not all of these models enable and even suggest elimination of a broader education for our college students. The general education concept is intended to give students a wide range of knowledge and exposure in a variety of areas.
2. The essential skills concept should be there to enhance the education for college students not substitute "skills" for the broader education content. As identified in the notes for proposed models three and four, many faculty want to keep that broad base of courses as the core of general education. It is evident that the model to be chosen should maintain the general education course structure and create a method to enhance that education with the essential skills.
3. Without the General Education Course Structure clearly identified in the model, schools will find ways to circumvent this intent and incorporate the identified Essential Skills in their degree curriculum. Example: the School of Business curriculum could incorporate all of these essential skills in their core business classes. This would eliminate the need for lab sciences, social and behavioral sciences, as well as the humanities and fine arts courses. These models should maintain and clearly identify the broader concept of general education.

Model #1 Rank: Third

Comments:

1. There is very little structure for assessment of skills. No different from current model in that respect.
2. As noted underneath the table model, the skills critical thinking, information literacy, and collaborative skills are unclear at best. It fails to identify what skill content is desired. It also fails to identify how those skills link to the core areas.
3. The model lacks common assessment of specific skills. Does not identify, or recommend any level of scope or depth of skills.

Model #2 Rank: Fourth

Comments:

1. Dividing the skills into multiple skill levels linked to "first-year and second-year" courses is unworkable across the curriculum. It creates Very Limited Selection of General Ed Courses for each student. It would require students to take courses in a specific order similar to a prerequisite system. This limits the students' ability to take a broad spectrum of courses across the curriculum. *Example:* a student would have to take Chemistry #1 and Chemistry #2 get to the second level of skills. If the student, took

Anthropology #1, they would not be able to take Chemistry (1 or 2) without missing the second level of skills. The alternative is to be forced to take Anthropology #2.

2. One skill per course rule is too restrictive. There are many courses that provide multiple skills varying depth. Subsequently, there also may be some courses that don't match well in reinforcing and mastering certain skills. Does this move them off the General Ed class list structure?
3. Capstone course is not relevant in GE curriculum. Capstone course can be effective within a major or concentration but attempting to develop a capstone concept across virtually unlimited number of degrees and majors would create an enormous bureaucracy.

Module #3 Rank: Second

Comments:

1. The Common Course Numbering system needs to be more clearly defined for this discussion. It must go beyond the literal course numbers and course names. It should be include primary course content across all state courses. Example: the articulated business curriculum is 100% match on primary course goals. (The 70% syllabus match, we determined is not a valid method). Of course simply matching course numbers and catalog descriptions does not create courses with the same content.
2. The Essential skills we are trying to evoke and evaluate must be correlated and coupled to assignments and assessment, not simply linked to course content. There can be an overlap of skills and content knowledge, but it is not inherent. Therefore skills should be assessed with the common tool (rubric).
3. Common course numbering and content could be reviewed/revise by a/the common course committee as mentioned in the model. But skills assignments should be designed by individual school/college faculty. They can best match skills with content, and faculty with skills assignments.
4. A skills evaluation tool (rubric) could be developed by, course committee, or by college/school faculty. In addition, schools could use common course "signature" assignments mapped to a particular skills and apply the common evaluation tool. The signature assignments could be a substitute for a capstone course methodology. And a signature assignment would be designed at the microenvironment level.
5. The table gives minimal accuracy and creates problems (as noted below the model). *Example* not all social and behavioral courses address quantitative skills, nor do they address **both** personal and social responsibility skills. Therefore, school/faculty/courses should self-select courses for matching essential skills.

Module #4 Rank: First

Comments:

1. This model contains all of problems and issues with the common course numbering in the module three discussion comment 1.
2. The mandate that each course carried two (2) skills is a problem for many courses. (See model 2, comment 2) This could/should be done at the college level (map skills to courses) to cover all graduates in the degree path.

3. Can HED review with the common requirements in a timely manner? Do they have the manpower in place to complete these core/program reviews across all colleges in New Mexico?
4. The statement that all institutions will adopt Essential Skills as they are college Common Student Learning Outcomes is overreaching. It could be/should be modified to include the words (all, part or integrated with college CSLO). Otherwise it is mandating elimination of any current Common Student Learning Outcomes in acceptance of the "skills" identified in these models.

Module #5 Rank: Fifth

Comments:

1. Model five is far too cumbersome and restrictive. It reflects all of the worst aspects of the previous four models.
2. The table presented with model five should map the skills to courses using the IRMA concept.

I = introduced, R = reinforced, M = mastered*, A = assessed**.

* Mastered the skill for the appropriate course level.

** Typically the content would be assessed at same time is master. Denoting MA